

## ALBANIAN *PIDH* : SLAVIC \*PEIZD<sup>1</sup>Ā

ERIC P. HAMP  
*University of Chicago*

The Slavic cognates of Alb. *pidh*, *-i* ‘vagina’ are well known and widely attested: Russ. *pizdá*, Ukr. *pyzdá* Bulg. and Boboščica (Albania) Macedonian *pízda*, Čakavski Serbian *pízdā*, Slovene *pízda*, Czech. *pízda*, Polish and Sorbian *pizda*, Polab. *péizda*. There can be no doubt of a Proto-Slavic \**peizd*ā.

Trautmann (211) and Vasmer (*REW*, 2.355) are surely right in branding Lith. *pyzdà* and Lett. *pízda* loanwords. Trautmann also allows the possibility that OPruss. *peisda* is a loan, but Vasmer has it “urverwandt”, along with Alb. *pidh*, *-i*. Considering the vocalism, as well as the meaning ‘arse’, there seems little reason to doubt the inherited status of the Old Prussian form.<sup>1</sup>

Trautmann then goes on to posit for the Albanian form a shape \**pizd-* or \**pízd-*, citing Meyer and Jokl. In view of the close agreement of Balto-Slavic and Albanian on this term, it seems much more reasonable to posit \**peizd-* (or \**peisd-*), although it should be noted that the genders (f. in Balto-Slavic, m. in Albanian) do not tally. If this is so, we have yet another instance of IE \**ei* for Albanian to put beside *dimēn* (see *IF*, 66.52-5, 1961). We have at the same time an interesting correspondence of detail shared by Balto-Slavic and Albanian exclusively. Moreover, this correspondence, if true, involves an innovation which requires further explanation. If, as has been assumed (Rozwadowski, *IF*, 5.354, 1895), this noun is etymologically an old complex \**pi-* (: \**epi*) plus \**sd-*, zero-grade of \**sed-*, we must assume, from the point of view of Indo-European, an abnormal formation with “normal grade” \**pei-* in an element (an old locative particle, at bottom) not regularly subject to such alternations. Pedersen (*KZ*, 38.418) has suggested that

<sup>1</sup> Despite Jokl’s claim (*IF*, 30.200-1) to the contrary that OPruss. *ei* is not decisive against a posited vocalism /i/. Jokl thereby seeks to make the Lettish and Lithuanian related.

*peisda* was related to *pъzdéti* as Lat. *pōdex* was to *pēdo*, Gk. βδέω. He was at the time more interested in the relationships of meaning and the possibility of seeing nouns derived from such verbs. But following up his suggestion in the case of *pъzdéti* with more emphasis on the question of the formal relationships, we immediately recognize that this verb, if analyzed synchronically as *pъzd-é-ti* rather than *\*pi-sd-*, belonged to a class that characteristically showed zero-grade in the root. Therefore, it would be natural to find a full-grade noun alongside it. Thus, from the internal Balto-Slavic point of view, it is easy to understand the motivation for the fresh formation of this apparently unetymological vocalic grade.

In passing, we may suppose that Lith. *p̄sti pisù pisaū* 'futuere' is neither from an impossible *\*piz-*, as Miklosich (*Et. Wb.*) would have it, nor from *\*pes-* (πέος 'penis') with Leskien, Wiedemann, Fick, Bechtel and Rozwadowski, nor from *\*pis-* 'grind, poke' with Brugmann, since now we should expect optimally Lith. -š- (*Karaliunas, Baltistica* 1.2., 1966). I propose that it is simply a fresh verb formed analogically *\*pizd-ti* > *pis-ti*. Then *pizē* and *pyzā* would be analogical folk distortions based on the old noun crossed with the apparent new verb stem.

Once we consider this point of ablaut, we realize that *\*peizd'ā* is not alone. If we regard this as continuing *\*pi-sd-* (: Skt. *pīdayati*, Gk. πιέζω *\*pisedī-*)<sup>2</sup> we are reminded of the similarly formed *\*ni-sd-* 'nest' (Skt. *nīdā-*, Lat. *nīdus*; *IEW*, 887), which turns out in Slavic as *\*gnēzd'o* (Russ. *gnezdó*, Štokav. *gnézdo*, *gnijèzdo*, Czech *hnízdo*).<sup>3</sup> Regardless of the problem of the initial, we seem here to have a pre-Slavic *\*(X)naizd'aN* (*X* stands for a laryngeal), with apparent ablaut *\*noi-*, a monstrosity from an IE point of view, but a normal Balto-Slavic thematic nominal formation.

On the other hand, Lith. *lizdas* points to an earlier *\*(X)nizda-*. Thus the innovation *\*(X)naizda-* is restricted to Slavic, and presupposes a verb *\*nizd-é-t(e)i* underlying the group, parallel to *\*pizd-é-t(e)i*. We thus posit a verb implied by the Slavic evidence which would be cognate with Armenian *nstim* 'sit (down)'; see Meillet, *Esquisse*, 108 on the last.

<sup>2</sup> See also H. W. Bailey, *BSOAS*, 21.526 (1958), on Skt. *ut-sad-*, and Iranian *had* 'treat violently'. The Ashkun Kafir of Wama seems to continue a derivative of *pīd-* in *pər'i* 'pudenda muliebris' (G. Morgenstierne, *NTS*, 16.119, 1951), which we may perhaps reconstruct as *\*pīdikā*.

<sup>3</sup> "vielleicht zu d. *Nest* usw. (lit. *lizdas*), aber lautlich unklar" – Pedersen, *IF*, 5.72 (1895).